


**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicants : Motoki Nakade, et al.  
Serial No. : 09/817,597  
For : COMMUNICATION SERVICE METHOD AND COMMUNICATION  
APPARATUS THEREOF  
Filed : March 26, 2001  
Examiner : Calvin L. Hewitt II  
Art Unit : 3621  
Confirmation No. : 7826

745 Fifth Avenue  
New York, NY 10151

**CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via  
Electronic Filing Services on September 7, 2007.

DeAndre Breeland  
(Name of person signing transmittal)  
  
Signature  
September 7, 2007  
Date of Signature

**PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 10-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1-4, 7, 8 and 10-22 are  
rejected in the Final Office Action mailed March 8, 2007 (the "Office Action").

**I. REASONS FOR THE REQUEST**

Applicant respectfully requests the Panel to consider the following arguments.

**(a) Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) & 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-4, 7, 8, 12-19 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,072,856 to Nachom (“Nachom”).

Claims 10, 11, 20 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Nachom in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,721,827 to Logan et al. (hereinafter merely “Logan”).

Independent claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“...superposing a first image signal transmitted from one of said plurality of communication terminal apparatus utilized by a first user with a second image signal of one or more products to generate a third image signal, said second image being offered by the communication terminal apparatus utilized by said first user to the communication terminal apparatus utilized by a second user; and

transmitting the third image signal to said communication terminal apparatus of said second user;

wherein detailed information of the one or more products is supplied to the plurality of communication terminal apparatus in response to a demand from the plurality of communication terminal apparatus...” (emphasis added)

As understood by the Applicants, Nachom relates to a method and system for placing an order for an item via the Internet. The item may be related to the subject matter of a first site being visited by a user or may be related to the subject matter of a purchase transaction conducted by the user on the first site. The first site issues a request to a second site to provide a related item from purchase by the user. The second site provides a display component having actuation unit thereon for the user to assent to or decline the purchase of the related item. If the user declines the item, the display component is removed. If the user assents to the purchase of

the item, the second site receives the billing and user information from the first site in a secure fashion, and the item is delivered to the user either by the second site or by outsourcing.

Applicants respectfully submit that Nachom does not teach or suggest the above identified feature of claim 1. Specifically, Nachom does not teach or suggest superposing a first image signal transmitted from one of the plurality of communication terminal apparatus utilized by a first user with a second image signal of one or more products to generate a third image signal, the second image being offered by the communication terminal apparatus utilized by the first user to the communication terminal apparatus utilized by a second user; and transmitting the third image signal to the communication terminal apparatus of the second user; wherein detailed information of the one or more products is supplied to the plurality of communication terminal apparatus in response to a demand from the plurality of communication terminal apparatus, as recited in claim 1.

Applicants further submit that the relied upon portions of Nachom merely teach transfer of URLs from one site to another and not the above identified feature of claim 1. Applicants further submit that Logan also fails to provide for this feature of claim 1.

Therefore claim 1 is patentable.


Since claim 14 is similar, or somewhat similar, in scope to claim 1, claim 14 is patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

Since the other claims are each dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, they are also patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

By:   
Thomas F. Presson  
Reg. No. 41,442

Telephone No.: (212) 588-0800  
Facsimile No.: (212) 588-0500